



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—NOTES ON JUVENAL.

3. 13-16.

Nunc sacri fontis nemus ac delubra locantur
Iudaeis quorum cophinus faenumque supellex,
omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est
arbor et eiectis mendicat silva Camenis.

The word *mercedem* reminded Mommsen (Sybel's Hist. Zeitschrift 64. 425 f. n. 3) of Vespasian's provision that the Jews should pay a fixed sum to Jupiter Capitolinus for the privilege of worshipping in the synagogues. Hence he assumed that a synagogue was located in the grove of Egeria. Juvenal's words, however, do not readily lend themselves to this interpretation. The money in question was paid, not into the treasury of Jupiter Capitolinus, but to the "people", i. e., into the *aerarium Saturni*. Again, if the money was paid for the privilege of visiting the synagogues, in what sense was it paid by "every tree"? We can scarcely take *omnis arbor* to mean "every (sacred) grove", for the rest of the sentence, as well as the entire passage, refers to one grove specifically—i. e., to that of Egeria. The same phrase makes difficulty for the theory that the Jews made their homes in the grove. Did they actually depend for shelter on the trees instead of on roofs?

The word *mendicat*, too, is suggestive. The Jews did not live in the grove, I think, and they did not visit it to worship: they were there to make a living. We need not, however, insist upon the literal meaning of the verb. The dividing line between modern beggars and the vendors of chewing gum, lead pencils, and shoe strings is very narrow, and the victims usually do not care to distinguish them at all. Probably these Jews were petty tradesmen. The *cophinus*,¹ then, was used to hold their wares,

¹ The current notion that the *cophinus* was characteristic of the Jews rather than of pedlars is as old as the time of Sidonius Apollinaris (Ep. 7. 6. 4). The idea was probably derived from a mistaken understanding of the passage we have before us and of its echo in 6. 542. It is well known that Juvenal was an author familiar to educated men in Sidonius' day. See id. Carm. 9. 269-273, and compare Amm. Marc. 28. 4. 14, and Rut. Nam. 1. 603 f.

and the hay served as a seat. Compare the beggar's mat of 5. 8 and 9. 140.

The reason why tradesmen chose this spot is suggested by Umbricius' purpose in tarrying here. Many carts besides his were undoubtedly loaded and unloaded near the gate during the first ten hours of the day; the spot was analogous to a modern railway station, at least in so far as it furnished a large number of possible buyers with a few moments to spare. Both buyers and sellers would find the shade of the grove agreeable, and so the poet found a tradesman established under every tree.

The *merces*, accordingly, was a license fee paid into the *aerarium* by the Jews for the privilege of selling their wares in the sacred grove. I do not know of any other reference to a license fee paid by tradesmen or by beggars either; but it is probable that the Romans did not totally neglect so obvious a way of collecting revenue from the foreigners in the city.

3. 254 ff.

Scinduntur tunicae sartae modo. Longa coruscat
serraco veniente abies, atque altera pinum
plaustra vehunt, nutant alte populoque minantur.

The editors understand that the accident to the *tunicae* is due to the confusion caused by the approach of the wagons, and so they punctuate with a comma or a colon after *modo*. There is, however, nothing to indicate that Juvenal felt any more connection between these two sentences than between the first of them and the preceding one. In this lively account of a journey through the streets some incidents are recounted at length, others as briefly as possible. Compare the sentence, *Pinguia crura luto*, in line 247, which has no connection with what precedes or follows, and should therefore be set off by periods. We might hesitate to ascribe such unevenness of treatment to another poet, but it is quite in Juvenal's manner (cf. Friedländer, p. 48).

It is not quite clear whose tunics are meant. Perhaps a number of people in the crowd are in the same plight (note the word *populo* two lines below). But in that case it is surprising that every one of the torn garments had been recently mended. It seems better to assume that they belong to the speaker¹ (cf. *mihi*

¹ The use of two tunics by one person was common at all periods. In addition to the passage from Pliny cited in the text, see Plaut. Pseud. 1298, Hor. Sat. I. 2. 25, Prop. 5. 2. 28.

in line 248). After he has turned his attention from the heavily laden slave and before he catches sight of the huge builders' wagons he has just time to note that he has suffered an accident which Pliny tells us is not uncommon in a crowd (Ep. 4. 16. 2). So he exclaims, "There! I've torn those tunics again!"¹

7. 82-87.

Curritur ad vocem iucundam et carmen amicae
Thebaidos, laetam cum fecit Statius urbem
promisitque diem; tanta dulcedine captos
adficit ille animos tantaque libidine volgi
auditur; sed cum fregit subsellia versu,
esurit, intactam Paridi nisi vendit Agaven.

Lewis translates *fregit subsellia* by "has made the benches resound" and compares 1. 13, *assiduo ruptae lectore columnae*, "the columns riven by the eternal reader" (so others, e. g., Weidner). But the emotional tone of the two passages is utterly different. In the first satire Juvenal has quite lost patience with the reciters and we are not surprised at some hyperbole in the account of the damage they do; but here his sympathies are with Statius: he certainly does not mean that the reciter's voice is so loud or his performance so long drawn out as to break the benches.

Another interpretation, which goes back to the fourth or fifth century,² supposes that the auditors became so excited in their applause that they destroyed the furniture. Such an occurrence would be natural enough at a chariot race or a gladiatorial contest or even at a contest between rival poets in case the contestants each had a strong following. It is worth noting, however, that there is no record of damage done by the applause of the spectators at any such contest. It has been reserved for Anglo-Saxon college students, under the excitement of a foot-ball victory, to build a bon-fire in the grand stand. Even with all due allowance for the much maligned Italian temperament, it seems incredible that the mild and rather tedious good taste of Statius' poems should have caused such a commotion. But, to waive this point

¹ Since this note was written, there has appeared in CW. 4. 53 a translation of the passage by Prof. F. S. Dunn, who understands it as I do, although he inadvertently writes "tunic" instead of tunics."

² Scholiast ad loc., as cited by Friedländer. Sidonius Apollinaris, Ep. 5. 10. 2, and Martianus Capella, 5. 436, use phrases that seem to reflect the same understanding of Juvenal's expression.

for the moment, is it necessary to impute such shockingly poor manners to the audiences at recitations in the first century? That applause was sometimes carried too far appears from Gellius 5. 1, where Musonius is quoted as saying that the auditors at a lecture on philosophy ought to express their approval quietly, not by shouting and gesticulation. Musonius, however, does not find it necessary to warn them against damaging the furniture. And in the passage before us Juvenal does not show Musonius' condemnatory attitude toward the occurrence he is describing. For once he is not writing in satirical vein; he finds no fault with Statius, and none with his hearers except that they do not pay.

The whole point of the passage is Statius' popularity. He draws such a crowd that their sheer weight breaks down the benches, as modern floors sometimes sink. Suetonius, Tiber. 40, says that on one occasion more than twenty thousand persons lost their lives upon the collapse of an amphitheatre, due, presumably, to overcrowding. That the tiers of seats provided for recitations were liable to similar accidents is shown by Suet. Claud. 41, where we are told of a recitation at which several benches were broken down *obesitate cujusdam*, to the very great confusion of the reader.

7. 126-128.

—atque ipse feroci

bellatore sedens curvatum hastile minatur
eminus et statua meditatatur proelia lusca.

Mayor understands *lusca* to mean that one eye is closed for the sake of helping the aim. Aside from the difficulty of getting such a meaning out of the word, we should remember that aiming a spear is a very different matter from aiming a gun: there would be no advantage in closing one eye. Friedländer is surely right in assuming that the statue is in need of repairs. Compare the references to broken statues of grandees at the beginning of the eighth satire. I follow Duff in his similar interpretation of *curvatum*; the spear had been bent by accident.

As usual, the poet is not content with a single slur upon his victim. Aemilius has the warlike ambitions of Domitian's Praetorian Praefect, of whom Juvenal says in similar phrase (4. 112).

Fuscus marmorea meditatus proelia villa.

But he hurls his spear *eminus*—here in his own house, at a safe

distance from the foe;¹ and besides it is only the dilapidated statue that is in the fight.

8. 76 f.

Miserum est aliorum incumbere famae,
ne conlapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis.

It was quite as impossible in ancient times as it is today for anyone in real life to pull down a roof by leaning against the supporting columns. Juvenal is certainly alluding to some mythical exploit of a man of extraordinary strength.

So far as we know, only two such stories were current in antiquity: Samson's destruction of the temple in Gaza (Judges 16. 29 f.), and the Greek story of Cleomedes of Astypalaea. Cleomedes was deprived of his prize in a boxing contest because he had killed his opponent. Crazy with disappointment he went into the school in his native town and overturned the column which supported the roof. The boys were killed, and Cleomedes had to flee for his life. The story makes its appearance in the extant literature in Plutarch Romulus 28,² but Plutarch refers to it as already familiar.

It is probable that Juvenal knew this Greek legend, but in some respects his lines fit better with the Hebrew story: *columnis* is in the plural; the context distinctly implies disaster to the man who pushes the columns down, whereas Cleomedes seems to have escaped unharmed. There is no difficulty in supposing that the poet had heard the story of Samson. He repeatedly displays a rather extensive though superficial knowledge about the Jews, as, for example, in 14. 96-106. Once, in fact, we seem to have an allusion to the book of Judges. In 6. 546 f. the Jewish fortune-teller is described as

interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos
arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli.

In commenting on the phrase *magna sacerdos arboris*, Duff says that Juvenal "cannot have known of the Hebrew prophetess, Deborah, who judged Israel and 'dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah' (Judges 4. 5)." To the present writer it does not seem impossible at all, especially as the parallelism extends

¹ This understanding of *eminus* was suggested by Professor Knapp.

² See other references in Rohde *Psyche*, p. 167. I am under obligations to Professor David M. Robinson for calling my attention to the tale.

beyond the one phrase. The two lines which we have quoted read like a paraphrase of the Hebrew narrative—"And Deborah a prophetess (*fida internuntia caeli*), the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel (*interpres legum Solymarum*) at that time. And she dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah." The satirist ironically identifies the palsied old fortune-teller with one of the heroines of Jewish legend.

Much as Juvenal disliked the orientals, it is quite obvious that they and their superstitions interested him profoundly. There is nothing strange in an allusion to Jewish legend in a poet who devotes a whole satire to the practices of certain obscure Egyptian fanatics. If, as some have held, the poet visited Egypt, he may have got his knowledge from the Jews of Alexandria. Such an assumption, however, is unnecessary. Given the interest in such matters, he could easily have satisfied it without leaving Rome.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

BARNARD COLLEGE.